

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

With this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 7, 11, 19, 26 and 27 and adds new claims 28-35. Accordingly, claims 1-35 are all the claims currently pending in the present application. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims.

#### **I. Statement of the Substance of the Interview**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26 and 27 during a telephone interview on March 23, 2009. During the interview, Applicant presented arguments in support of the claim recitations “collating data corresponding to the element” containing subject matter which was indeed described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to a skilled artisan, at the time the application was filed, that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner agreed that the arguments presented during the interview would overcome the § 112, first paragraph rejection if the arguments were set forth herein. Applicant submits the arguments discussed during the interview below.

#### **II. Rejections of Claims 1, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26 & 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. (See pg. 2 of the Office Action) On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the claim recitations “collating data corresponding to the element ...” is not clearly described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As an initial matter, Applicant submits that the originally-filed claims and at least page 4, lines 1-3 of the originally-filed specification provides support for the claim terms collating data corresponding to the element and rendering a display of collated data. Additionally, Applicant submits that the skilled artisan would understand that the claim term “collating” has its normal meaning, that is to say for example, to bring together or assemble in order. Moreover, the skilled artisan in HTML programming, for example, would

understand that the claim terms “collating data corresponding to the element” in order to display the collated data means, for example, bringing together information from a code associated with the element to allow information associated with the element to be displayed. As such, the claim recitations “collating data corresponding to the element” were described in the specification in such a way as to convey to a skilled artisan that the Applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed and a skilled artisan would not require further explanation.

Moreover, at least page 19, lines 11-15 of the originally-filed specification and FIG. 7 of the originally-filed application provides support for a non-limiting example embodiment pertaining to collating data corresponding to an element in a hypermedia document. For instance, page 19, lines 11-15 describes that “At step S1, the XHTML document is parsed and at step S2, items that have been marked with an accesskey element are identified. The links associated with the elements naming an accesskey attribute are then included in an options list at step S3.” Clearly then, a skilled artisan would recognize that in one example embodiment, the step of collating data corresponding to the element (as recited in independent claims 1, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26 and 27) means assembling a code corresponding to a link in a list for display. As such, Applicant submits that the claim recitations “collating data corresponding to the element” were indeed described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the Applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time that the application was filed.

Based on at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26 and 27.

### **III. New Claims**

Applicant herein adds new claims 28-35 to add more varied protection of Applicant’s invention as described in the specification. In addition to their respective dependencies from claims 1, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26 and 27, Applicant submits that new claims 28-35 recite independently patentable subject matter.


Appl. No.: 10/041,610  
Amdt. dated March 30, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2008

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Examiner Jean-Gilles is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Cory C. Davis  
Registration No. 59,932

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000  
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON March 30, 2009.